

That, Mr. President, summarizes the process pretty well. Military readiness and the situation in Colombia are not in and of themselves important enough to warrant support for this spending bill. It seems this Senate must have its pork. It must have its \$25 million for a Customs Service training facility at Harpers Ferry, West Virginia, a site most certainly chosen for its bucolic charm and operational attributes rather than for parochial reasons. It must have its \$225,000 for the Nebraska State Patrol Digital Distance Learning project. It must have over \$3 million earmarked for anti-doping activities at the 2002 Olympics, in addition to the \$8 million for Defense Department support of these essential national security activities on the ski slopes of Utah. It must have \$300,000 for Indian tribes in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana and Minnesota. The hard-working taxpayers of America deserve better.

Those of us who had the misfortune of witnessing one of the most disgraceful and blatant explosions of pork-barrel spending in the annals of modern American parliamentary history, the ISTE bill of 1998, should be astounded to see the projects funded in this emergency spending bill:

\$1.2 million for the Paso Del Norte International Bridge in Texas;

\$9 million for the US 82 Mississippi River Bridge in Mississippi;

\$2 million for the Union Village/Cambridge Junction bridges in Vermont;

\$5 million for the Naheola Bridge in Alabama;

\$3 million for the Hoover Dam Bypass in Arizona and Nevada;

\$3 million for the Witt-Penn Bridge in New Jersey; and

\$12 million for the Florida Memorial Bridge in Florida.

These, Mr. President, are but the tip of the iceberg—an iceberg that shall not stand in the way of the icebreaker added to this bill, albeit for more credible reasons than the vast majority of member add-ons.

As I stated earlier, tracking the process by which the bill came before us was a truly Byzantine experience. The addition of \$600,000 for the Lewis and Clark Rural Water System in South Dakota serves as sort of a tribute to the unusual path down which this legislation has traveled. The most skilled legislative adventurers would be hard pressed to follow the trail this bill followed before arriving at its destination here on the floor of the Senate.

I cannot emphasize enough the significance of piling billions of dollars in pork and unrequested earmarks into a bill that was categorized for budgetary purposes as "emergency." Consider the distinction between emergency spending essential for the preservation of liberty and to deal with genuine emergencies that cannot wait for the usual annual appropriations process, and the manner in which Congress abuses that concept and undermines the integrity of the budgeting process. When I review

an emergency spending measure and read earmarks like \$2.2 million for the Anchorage, Alaska Senior Center; \$500,000 for the Shedd Aquarium/Brookfield Zoo for science education programs for local school students; \$1 million for the Center for Research on Aging at Rush-Presbyterian-St. Luke's Medical Center in Chicago; and \$8 million for the City of Libby in Montana, plus another \$3.5 million for the Saint John's Lutheran Hospital in Libby, I am more than a little perplexed about the propriety of our actions here.

Is the American public expected to believe that a spending bill essential for national security should include emergency funding for Dungeness fishing vessel crew members, U.S. fish processors in Alaska, and the Buy N Pack Seafoods processor in Hoonah, Alaska, research and education relating to the North Pacific marine ecosystem, and the lease, operation and upgrading of facilities at the Alaska SeaLife Center, and the \$7 million for observer coverage for the Hawaiian long-line fishery and to study interaction with sea turtles in the North Pacific. Finally, and not to belabor the point, is the \$1 million for the State of Alaska to develop a cooperative research plan to restore the crab fishery truly a national security imperative?

When the bill was on the floor of the Senate, my friend and colleague from Texas, Senator GRAMM, referred to the sadly typical smoke and mirrors budgeting gimmickry pervasive in the legislation. I am always disturbed when such budgeting gimmicks designed to prevent Congress from complying with the revenue and spending levels agreed to in the Budget Resolution are employed. While I am grateful that a deal was struck by which they will be reversed in another bill, the use of such gimmicks is a betrayal of our responsibility to spend the taxpayers' dollars responsibly and enact laws and policies that reflect the best interests of all Americans. It is a betrayal of the public trust that is essential to a working democracy.

The bill, as currently written and signed into law, waives the budget caps to allow for more discretionary spending. It also waived the firewall in the budget resolution between defense and nondefense spending on outlays. The end result would be that Congress would have the freedom to move the \$2.6 billion the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee did not spend on much-needed readiness into non-defense spending.

The recently-passed legislation further changes current law and shifts the payment date for SSI, the Supplemental Security Income program, from October back to September. What that would do is shift money into fiscal year 2000. In the process, it would allow \$2.4 billion more be spent in fiscal year 2001 by spending that same amount of money in the previous year. The legislation also includes the gimmick of moving the pay date for veterans' com-

pensation and pensions from fiscal year 2001 to fiscal year 2000. Both of these provisions are further examples of the irresponsible budget gimmickry that allows the Congress to spend more without any accountability. I am thankful that a commitment was made to reverse these decisions in subsequent legislation; I abhor the fact that they will almost certainly be used again in the future.

To conclude, the Military Construction and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations bill passed prior to recess, and without members of the Senate having a realistic opportunity to review that multibillion dollar commitment, is a travesty, a thorough slap in the face of all Americans concerned about fiscal responsibility, national security, the scourge of drugs on our streets, and the integrity of the representation they send to Congress. We should be ashamed of ourselves for passing this bill. Unfortunately, shame continues to elude us, and the country, and our democracy, is poorer for that flaw in our collective character.

VICTIMS OF GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, it has been more than a year since the Columbine tragedy, but still this Republican Congress refuses to act on sensible gun legislation.

Since Columbine, thousands of Americans have been killed by gunfire. Until we act, Democrats in the Senate will read some of the names of those who lost their lives to gun violence in the past year, and we will continue to do so every day that the Senate is in session.

In the name of those who died, we will continue this fight. Following are the names of some of the people who were killed by gunfire one year ago today.

July 11, 1999:

Thomas Erwin, 36, Oklahoma City, OK; Bernard Harrison, 17, Baltimore, MD; Anthony L. Holt, 28, Chicago, IL; Judy Holt, 47, Dallas, TX; Christopher F. James, 34, Oklahoma City, OK; Byron Sanders, 17, Baltimore, MD; Eugene Smith, 21, Charlotte, NC; Nakia Walker, 25, Washington, DC; Unidentified male, 23, Newark, NJ.

FISCAL YEAR 2001 LABOR-HHS-EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS AND THE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, on June 30, the Senate passed S. 2553, the Fiscal Year 2001 Labor-HHS-Education Appropriations bill, by a vote of 52-43. I voted against this measure because of my belief that it provides an unjustified increase in federal spending and employs a variety of gimmicks that are meant to hide the true size of its costs.

As my colleague from Texas, Senator GRAMM, recently pointed out, the fiscal year 2001 Labor-HHS bill increases discretionary spending by more than 20

percent when compared to last year's bill. As it is, this is incredible growth in discretionary spending; however, to truly emphasize the enormity of this increase, my colleagues should consider that this growth in spending is roughly 10 times the current rate of inflation.

The bill hides this massive increase in discretionary spending by using a variety of gimmicks. First, it proposes to offset the new spending by making cuts in crucial mandatory programs, such as the Social Services Block Grant (SSBG), the State Children's Health Insurance Program (S-CHIP) and Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF). After a number of colleagues and I expressed our concern over using these programs as spending offsets, Appropriations Committee Chairman STEVENS pledged his support to vitiate these cuts when the Labor-HHS bill is considered in Conference. While I commend Chairman STEVENS for his commitment to restoring these funds, it is my belief that the Appropriations Committee never should have tapped into these programs in the first place. It is my hope that the Conferees will, as they remove these offsets, look to decrease the overall level of discretionary spending in the bill rather than search for other sources.

Second, the bill moves up by 3 days the first Supplemental Security Income (SSI) payment date of Fiscal Year 2001 so that it falls, instead, in Fiscal Year 2000. Although such a change sounds innocuous, the ramifications of this action are tremendous.

As my colleagues know, the start of the next fiscal year begins on October 1, 2000. By moving the first SSI payment date of the year a few days earlier, it will fall in the waning days of fiscal year 2000 and be paid for out of the fiscal year 2000 on-budget surplus. The end result of this gimmick is that not only does it increase spending in FY 2000 by \$2.4 billion, which is, by the way, money I would rather see go to debt reduction. But it also frees up another \$2.4 billion in Fiscal Year 2001 for Congress to spend.

Finally, despite the fact that the bill increases discretionary spending by a whopping 20 percent, it still fails to prioritize and target resources towards those programs that are the responsibility of the federal government, such as fully funding our commitment under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The high cost of educating disabled students continues to place a heavy burden on our local school districts. If the federal government met its obligation to fund IDEA at the level it promised in 1975, local communities would have resources left over to fund their own education priorities.

Instead, this appropriations bill, while increasing funding for IDEA by \$1.31 billion over last year's bill and by \$984 million above President Clinton's request, does not make enough progress on IDEA. Before the federal government increases spending on new programs, it should be fully funding its

promise to supply up to 40 percent of the cost of educating disabled children.

Mr. President, what Congress has done in this Labor-HHS bill proves that we must face facts: Congress is addicted to spending. We will use any gimmick, any trick, any scheme we can think of to spend money. Often, it is for things that we don't need, things that are not a federal responsibility or things that we cannot afford.

Instead of using cuts in mandatory programs and accounting shifts to pay for massive increases in discretionary programs, we need to prioritize our spending and make the hard choices when necessary. We have used budgetary shenanigans far too often to obfuscate the size of spending increases, and it is long past time for this practice to end.

It is for these reasons, Mr. President, that I felt compelled to vote against the Labor-HHS Appropriations bill, and I do not believe that I am alone in my concerns regarding this legislation. It is my sincere hope that when the conferees meet to put together the final version of this legislation, they will consider and address the items that I have mentioned.

Mr. President, I also would like to take this opportunity to voice my concern over the conference report to H.R. 4425, the Military Construction Appropriations bill, which the Senate approved on June 30 by a voice vote. If it had been the subject of a roll call vote, I would have voted against final passage of this bill.

My concern with this legislation does not rest with the Military Construction portion of the conference report. Indeed, I voted for the bill when it originally came before the Senate in May. Rather, my concern lies with what was added to the bill since the time the Senate first passed it.

While in conference, the Military Construction Appropriations bill became the vehicle to which Fiscal Year 2000 emergency supplemental appropriations were attached. In times of true emergency, Mr. President, I believe that Congress has an obligation to ensure that supplemental funds are provided to cover unexpected expenses. That is why I have no objection to providing emergency funds for our operations in Kosovo and to those unfortunate Americans who have been the victims of natural disasters.

However, I do not believe that we should provide emergency funding for items that are not true emergencies in an effort to avoid budget rules. Unfortunately, that is precisely what H.R. 4425 does. This bill provides taxpayer dollars for such "emergencies" as the winter Olympic Games, a sea life center in Alaska and a new top-of-the-line Gulfstream jet aircraft for the Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard.

In recent years, we have seen remarkable growth in the use of emergency designations as a way to bypass the spending caps so that Congress can avoid making tough choices. Fiscal year 2000 is certainly no exception. In fact, we will be setting a new record for

"emergency" spending in this fiscal year with a final tally of more than \$40 billion.

I should also add, Mr. President, that H.R. 4425 speeds up government pay-days and uses other accounting shifts to move nearly \$12 billion of fiscal year 2001 spending into fiscal year 2000. Just as with the Labor-HHS Appropriations Bill, the conference committee used this gimmick in order to free up an additional \$12 billion for Congress to spend in Fiscal Year 2001.

Mr. President, rather than devising new, more ingenious ways to avoid fiscal discipline, we should be endeavoring to restore honesty and integrity to the congressional budget process. As I have stated on previous occasions, if any American was to cook his or her books the way the federal government does, that individual no doubt would be sent to jail very quickly. We cannot continue to apply a double standard. We must live within our means, delineate responsibility between the state and local governments and the federal government and pay for those items accordingly, and for Heaven's sake, if we have any on-budget surplus funds, use those funds to pay down the National Debt.

I will continue to monitor the progress of the remaining appropriations bills, and I encourage my colleagues to work with me to make sure that we spend federal tax dollars wisely.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

—

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT OF 2000

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, in 1994 we passed the original Violence Against Women Act, creating programs that addressed the many forms of domestic violence all-too prevalent in the United States today. The bill helped communities create shelters, build partnerships among law enforcement agencies to respond to violence against women, and provide legal assistance to battered women. The bill also established a domestic violence hotline that receives hundreds of calls daily from people concerned about violence in their families. Now, we have the opportunity and responsibility to reauthorize this legislation to give women and children a way out of violent and unhealthy situations.

For groups that strive to combat domestic violence, the original Violence Against Women Act was a turning point in their battle. In my state, the West Virginia Coalition Against Domestic Violence stands as an outstanding example of the great work that groups devoted to the noble cause of stamping out domestic violence can do when Congress acts appropriately. With the added funding provided by the Violence Against Women Act, the Coalition was able to quadruple its staff, increase the budgets of its shelters to